

### REMARKS

This Amendment responds to the Office Action dated July 10, 2006 in which the Examiner rejected claims 5-6, 8-9, 12-13 and 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, rejected claims 1-4, 7, 10-11 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) and rejected claims 5-6, 8-9, 12-13 and 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

As indicated above, the claims have been amended in order to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraws the rejection to the claims under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Claims 1-4, 7, 10-11 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a). The claims have been reviewed in light of the Office Action, and for reasons which will be set forth below, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraws the rejection to the claims and allows the claims to issue.

The copy of the document Ecolore sent to Applicants has a first page which states "sorry the document is not currently available" and asks to choose a language EL or EN. The second page is from the wayback machine listing a plurality of results for the website Ecolore. The third page is in Cyrillic. The fourth page is from the wayback machine and discloses two pages of information which are prior to Applicant's foreign priority date. However, a copy of these pages is not provided. The next page has the title Glossaries and cites a translation and interpretive terminology and a Unicode glossary. The next page appears to be a duplicate of page 4. The next five pages have a title "glossaries" and appear to disclose a computer program. The next five pages are entitled "glossaries -e1" and are also a

listing of a computer program. The last five pages are entitled "glossaries-en" and are similarly a computer program.

Thus, the reference supplied by the Examiner merely appears to disclose source code for three glossaries. Nothing in Encolore shows, teaches or suggests that these glossaries a) define content of data to be displayed, b) define file names of the data definition files or c) define a style for displaying the data definition file as claimed in claims 1, 7, 11 and 14. Rather, the three sets of glossaries of Encolore merely disclose source code with no definition as to how they are used or stored.

The current version of Ecolore on the web states that it is directed to translator training. The glossaries provided are definitions related to translation and interpreting terminology. The second glossary that is provided is a glossary of abbreviations and the third glossary is defined as a glossary of terms related to e-content localization. Thus, none of the glossaries in Ecolore a) define content of data to be displayed, b) define file names of the data definition files and c) define a style for displaying the data definition files. Furthermore, Ecolore does not show, teach or suggest that these glossaries are stored in first, second or third memories as claimed in claims 1, 7, 11 and 14. Rather, Ecolore only discloses a translator training tool having glossaries related to translation.

Since nothing in Ecolore shows, teaches or suggests the features as claimed in claims 1, 7, 11 and 14, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to the claims and allows the claims to issue.

Claims 2-4 and 10 depend from claims 1 and 7 and recite additional features. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-4 and 10 would not have been anticipated by Ecolore at least for the reasons as set forth above. Therefore,

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 2-4 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a).

Claims 5-6, 8-9, 12-13 and 15-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Ecolore in view of *Bravery et al.* (U.S. Publication no. 2003/0037076).

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103. The claims have been reviewed in light of the Office Action, and for reasons which will be set forth below, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraws the rejection to the claims and allows the claims to issue.

As discussed above, since nothing in Ecolore shows, teaches or suggests the features as claimed in claims 1, 7, 11 and 14, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Ecolore with the secondary reference to *Bravery et al.* will not overcome the deficiencies of the primary reference. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 5-6, 8-9, 12-13 and 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

The prior art of record, which is not relied upon, is acknowledged. The references taken singularly or in combination do not anticipate or make obvious the claimed invention.

Thus it now appears that the application is in condition for reconsideration and allowance. Reconsideration and allowance at an early date are respectfully requested.

If for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact, by telephone, the

applicant's undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed within the currently set shortened statutory period, applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such extension of time may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

In the event that any additional fees are due with this paper, please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: November 9, 2006

By:

E. Marcie Emas By R. S. Mullen  
Ellen Marcie Emas  
Registration No. 32131  
Reg # 28531

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404  
703 836 6620